

05PTO101:D241eAM3.PAM.doc:7/14/05:eff

(D24-1e)

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|             |                             |   |                       |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Applicants: | Kevin A. Kelly              | ) |                       |
|             | Thomas E. Lach              | ) |                       |
|             | Ralph D. Lach               | ) | Group Art Unit 3764   |
|             | Arthur W. Handshy           | ) |                       |
|             |                             | ) | Examiner T. M. Nguyen |
| Serial No:  | 10/705,487                  | ) |                       |
|             |                             | ) |                       |
| Filed:      | November 11, 2003           | ) |                       |
|             |                             | ) |                       |
| For:        | CHEST COMPRESSION APPARATUS | ) |                       |
|             | FOR CARDIAC ARREST          | ) |                       |

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**JUL 14 2005**

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION  
AND ELECTION REQUIREMENTS**

In response to the June 14, 2005, Office action, please consider the subject application further in light of the following:

**REMARKS**

The June 14, 2005, Office action first required restriction between two groups of claims. Group I included the method claims for CPR while Group II related to CPR apparatus for increasing the flow of blood in a patient. Applicants select with traverse the apparatus claims of **Group II**.

Further, the Office action required an election of species between those shown in Figures 1 (species A), 4 (species B), 5 (species C), 6 (species D), 7 (species E), 8 (species F), 9 (species G), 11 (species H), 12 (species I), and 13 (species J). Consonant with their obligation, Applicants elect the **species D** covering the embodiment of **Figure 6**. The claims readable upon this species include **Claims 102 to 111, 193, and 194**.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction and election requirements of the June 14, 2005, Office action. All of the claims in the subject application, as well as all of the figures, derive from a single inventive concept. Accordingly, examining them together would appear to entail a significant savings in effort and expense on the part of both the Patent and Trademark Office and Applicants. Accordingly, the removal of the restriction and election requirements would appear warranted and is respectfully requested.